



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,776	10/20/2003	Kyung Su Chae	0465-0990P	9604

2292 7590 11/29/2007  
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH  
PO BOX 747  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER
----------

MILLER, MICHAEL G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1792

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

11/29/2007

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/687,776

**Applicant(s)**

CHAE ET AL.

**Examiner**Michael G. Miller *MGM***Art Unit**

1792

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2 nov 2004</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Response to Restriction Requirement***

- 1) Applicant's election of Claims 1-14 in the reply filed on 21 September 2007 is acknowledged. Because Applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
- 2) Claims 15-22 withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected method, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 21 September 2007.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

- 3) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 4) The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- (1) Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- (2) Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

- (3) Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  - (4) Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 5) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 6) As these claims are drawn to a device, portions of the claim which do not define physical structure will be given limited patentable weight to the extent that they provide requirements that the device must be capable of.
- 7) Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Satoi (US Patent 6,331,384, hereinafter '384) and Fairbairn et al (US Patent 6,176,667, hereinafter '667).
- 8) With regard to Claim 1, '384/'667 teaches a device usable for forming an alignment layer of a display apparatus, the device comprising:
  - a) A printing part (Column 12 Lines 36-64, specifically the stage 52) to print an alignment layer on a substrate;
  - b) A drying part (Column 13 Lines 1-15, specifically referencing heating apparatus 208) to dry the alignment layer printed on the substrate; and

- c) A transferring part (Column 14 Lines 36-49 discussing conveyors and robots) to transfer the substrate.
- d) '384 does not teach that the drying part is disposed above the printing part. However, '384 teaches that its linear embodiment is only exemplary and that the units can be individual with substrates transferred individually (Column 18 Lines 38-45).
- e) '667 teaches that stacking process chambers above each other can reduce the floor space needed for a process, allowing for more efficient use of space. This speaks to a problem stated by Applicant of more efficiently using clean room space.
- f) Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the apparatus of '384 by adding the teaching of '667 to stack the portions of the apparatus because '384 teaches that the portions of the apparatus can be modular and '667 teaches that stacking modular apparatuses improves the optimization of floor space.
- g) As far as the limitation of disposing the drying part above the printing part, this claim would have been obvious because a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options with his or her technical grasp. If this leads to the anticipated success, it is likely the product not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense. In a stacked system consisting of a printing part and a drying part, there are two permutations that these can be stacked in (e.g., drying over printing and printing over

drying). One of ordinary skill in the art could have chosen from either of these options with an equally reasonable expectation of success.

9) With regard to Claim 2, '384/'667 teaches the device of claim 1, further comprising:

- a) At least one inkjet head ('384 Column 12 Lines 36-49) to spray an alignment material onto the substrate and thereby print the alignment layer and being positioned between the printing part and the drying part ('384 Figure 7 shows the inkjet head above the printing part, which is below the drying part by the discussion above).

10) With regard to Claim 3, '384/'667 teaches the device of claim 2, wherein:

- a) At least one array of inkjet heads is positioned in one line according to a long side or a short side of the substrate ('384 Column 19 Lines 42-49) to print the alignment layer onto the long or short side of the substrate at one time.

11) With regard to Claim 4, '384/'667 teaches the device of claim 3, wherein:

- a) A size and an arrangement of the inkjet heads are varied according to a size and a kind of the substrate ('384 Column 8 Line 62 – Column 9 Line 26; if a mono-color filter is desired, all the print heads print one color as discussed in Column 18 Lines 46-49; and the width of printing is determined by the maximum width of the substrate as discussed in Column 19 Lines 42-49).

12) With regards to Claim 5 and 6, '384 teaches a print table to receive the substrate and an inkjet head ('384 Column 12 Lines 36 – 51, talking about

moving a print stage and driving an inkjet head assembly); as each of these parts can be moved independently, the apparatus can function by moving the substrate under the stationary inkjet head (Claim 5) or by moving the inkjet over the stationary plate (Claim 6).

13)With regard to Claim 7, '384/'667 teach that the coatings are applied by inkjet deposition. Polyimide PI is capable of being deposited by inkjet and therefore the device taught in claim 1 is capable of meeting the limitation of claim 7.

14)With regards to Claim 8 and 9, '384/'667 teaches the device of claim 1, wherein:

a) The drying part includes a dry table ('384 Column 10 Lines 62-65 teaches an oven; Column 9 Lines 47-50 teach that hot plates and hot-air ovens are interchangeable in this process) to dry the alignment layer printed on the substrate by emitting heat.

15)With regard to Claim 10, '384/'667 teaches the device of claim 1, wherein:

a) The transferring part includes a transfer robot to transfer the substrate from the printing part to the drying part by elevating the substrate ('384 Column 14 Line 60 – Column 15 Line 27 details a robot capable of motion in the vertical and radial directions of cylindrical coordinates; choosing a robot for this transfer would be one of a finite number of choices that a person skilled in the art would be able to choose between with a reasonable expectation of success).

16)With regard to Claim 11, it is well known in the art that alignment layers can be provided in LCD devices. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a

person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a device capable of printing alignment layers for the purpose of printing alignment layers in LCD devices.

17)With regard to Claim 12, '384/'667 teaches that it is known to manufacture electronic components in clean rooms ('667 Column 1 Lines 5 – 30).

18)With regard to Claim 13, '384/'667 teaches the device of claim 1, wherein:

a) The drying part is positioned directly and vertically above the printing part (discussed in the rejection of Claim 1).

19)Claim 14 invokes the "means for" language of 35 U.S.C. 112, 6th paragraph.

Examiner has interpreted "means for printing" as meaning a printing table in accordance with Claim 1 and paragraph 0043 or an inkjet head in accordance with Claim 3 and paragraph 0043-0044. Examiner has interpreted "means for drying" as a drying table in accordance with Claim 1 and paragraphs 0043 and 0045. Examiner has interpreted "means for transferring" as a transfer robot in accordance with Claim 10 and paragraph 0047). In view of these interpretations, the basis of rejection in Claim 1 applies to Claim 14 as well.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael G. Miller whose telephone number is (571) 270-1861. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Cleveland can be reached on (571) 272-1418.



Application/Control Number:  
10/687,776  
Art Unit: 1792

Page 8

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MGM MGM

  
MICHAEL CLEVELAND  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Restriction Requirement*

- 1) Applicant's election with traverse of Claims 1-14 in the reply filed on 21

September 2007 is acknowledged.

- 2) Claims 15-22 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR

1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected method, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Use  
FP 8-25-02  
and  
then FPS-06

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

- 3) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 4) The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- (1) Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- (2) Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- (3) Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- (4) Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6) As these claims are drawn to a device, portions of the claim which do not define physical structure will be given limited patentable weight to the extent that they provide requirements that the device must be capable of.

7) Claims 1-6, 8-10 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Satoi (US Patent 6,331,384, hereinafter '384) and Fairbairn et al (US Patent 6,176,667, hereinafter '667).

8) With regard to Claim 1, '384/'667 teaches a device usable for forming an alignment layer of a display apparatus, the device comprising:

- a) A printing part (Column 12 Lines 36-64, specifically the stage 52) to print an alignment layer on a substrate;
- b) A drying part (Column 13 Lines 1-15, specifically referencing heating apparatus 208) to dry the alignment layer printed on the substrate; and
- c) A transferring part (Column 14 Lines 36-49 discussing conveyors and robots) to transfer the substrate.

You did not  
discuss claim  
12.

For 7 and 11,  
see p. 7

- d) '384 does not teach that the drying part is disposed above the printing part. However, '384 teaches that its linear embodiment is only exemplary and that the units can be individual with substrates transferred individually (Column 18 Lines 38-45).
- e) '667 teaches that stacking process chambers above each other can reduce the floor space needed for a process, allowing for more efficient use of space. This speaks to a problem stated by Applicant of more efficiently using clean room space.
- f) Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the apparatus of '384 by adding the teaching of '667 to stack the portions of the apparatus because '384 teaches that the portions of the apparatus can be modular and '667 teaches that stacking modular apparatuses improves the optimization of floor space.
- g) As far as the limitation of disposing the drying part above the printing part, this claim would have been obvious because a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options with his or her technical grasp. If this leads to the anticipated success, it is likely the product not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense. In a stacked system consisting of a printing part and a drying part, there are two permutations that these can be stacked in (e.g., drying over printing and printing over drying). One of ordinary skill in the art could have chosen from either of these options with an equally reasonable expectation of success.

- 9) With regard to Claim 2, '384/'667 teaches the device of claim 1, further comprising:
- a) At least one inkjet head ('384 Column 12 Lines 36-49) to spray an alignment material onto the substrate and thereby print the alignment layer and being positioned between the printing part and the drying part ('384 Figure 7 shows the inkjet head above the printing part, which is below the drying part by the discussion above).
- 10) With regard to Claim 3, '384/'667 teaches the device of claim 2, wherein:
- a) At least one array of inkjet heads is positioned in one line according to a long side or a short side of the substrate ('384 Column 19 Lines 42-49) to print the alignment layer onto the long or short side of the substrate at one time.
- 11) With regard to Claim 4, '384/'667 teaches the device of claim 3, wherein:
- a) A size and an arrangement of the inkjet heads are varied according to a size and a kind of the substrate ('384 Column 8 Line 62 – Column 9 Line 26; if a mono-color filter is desired, all the print heads print one color as discussed in Column 18 Lines 46-49; and the width of printing is determined by the maximum width of the substrate as discussed in Column 19 Lines 42-49).
- 12) With regards to Claim 5 and 6, '384 teaches a print table to receive the substrate and an inkjet head ('384 Column 12 Lines 36 – 51, talking about moving a print stage and driving an inkjet head assembly); as each of these parts can be moved independently, the apparatus can function by moving the

substrate under the stationary inkjet head (Claim 5) or by moving the inkjet over the stationary plate (Claim 6).

13)With regards to Claim 8 and 9, '384/'667 teaches the device of claim 1, wherein:

a) The drying part includes a dry table ('384 Column 10 Lines 62-65 teaches an oven; Column 9 Lines 47-50 teach that hot plates and hot-air ovens are interchangeable in this process) to dry the alignment layer printed on the substrate by emitting heat.

14)With regard to Claim 10, '384/'667 teaches the device of claim 1, wherein:

a) The transferring part includes a transfer robot to transfer the substrate from the printing part to the drying part by elevating the substrate ('384 Column 14 Line 60 – Column 15 Line 27 details a robot capable of motion in the vertical and radial directions of cylindrical coordinates; choosing a robot for this transfer would be one of a finite number of choices that a person skilled in the art would be able to choose between with a reasonable expectation of success.).

15)With regard to Claim 13, '384/'667 teaches the device of claim 1, wherein:

a) The drying part is positioned directly and vertically above the printing part (discussed in the rejection of Claim 1).

16)Claim 14 invokes the "means for" language of 35 U.S.C. 112, 6th paragraph.

Examiner has interpreted "means for printing" as meaning a printing table in accordance with Claim 1 and paragraph 0043 or an inkjet head in accordance with Claim 3 and paragraph 0043-0044. Examiner has interpreted "means for

drying" as a drying table in accordance with Claim 1 and paragraphs 0043 and 0045. Examiner has interpreted "means for transferring" as a transfer robot in accordance with Claim 10 and paragraph 0047). In view of these interpretations, the basis of rejection in Claim 1 applies to Claim 14 as well.

- 17) Claims 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '384/'667 in view of Yasuda et al (US PGPub 2002/0173617, hereinafter '617). *You can leave this but I'd make these*
- 18) With regard to Claim 7, '384/'667 do not explicitly teach spraying polyimide PI *102s by* from the inkjet head assembly. However, as this is a device claim, the *assertion. Inkjet printers* construction only needs to be capable of doing such. '617 teaches that *are capable of printing* polyimide PI can be dispensed onto a substrate using inkjet deposition to *polyimide. I'd* form an alignment layer (PG0078). Therefore, it would have been obvious to *have saved* a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to *'617 as* have modified the apparatus of '384/'667 to have dispensed polyimide PI as *evidence in* taught in '614 because '384/'667 wants to dispense compounds onto *case they* substrate surfaces by inkjet deposition and '614 teaches that polyimide PI is a *argue* suitable material for the purpose. *non-enabled*

- 19) With regard to Claim 11, '384/'667/'617 teaches the device of claim 1, wherein:

- a) The alignment layer is an alignment layer provided in a liquid crystal display device ('617 PG 0078-0079 teach that alignment layers dispensed in this manner can be used in LCD devices).

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael G. Miller whose telephone number is (571) 270-1861. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Cleveland can be reached on (571) 272-1418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MGM *MGM*